

Throughout his distinguished career, Michael Harrington rose from patrolman to the rank of captain. Along the way he received numerous awards and commendations.

Through the years, he was commanding officer of a number of Port Authority transportation facilities, including the Lincoln Tunnel, the Holland Tunnel, the George Washington Bridge, Newark International Airport, and PATH.

At one point, he was in the incredibly demanding role of serving as commander of the Lincoln and Holland Tunnels, as well as the George Washington Bridge, all at the same time.

□ 2350

When we ask Captain Harrington who instilled in him the importance of hard work, he will tell us it was his father. Cornelius Harrington worked for more than 40 years as an operating engineer for Standard Oil of New Jersey; and, like his son, he never missed a day of work.

There is far more behind Captain Harrington's exceptional career than just an example of his father's setting. His uncompromising devotion to his job is a tribute to his own sense of duty to the public and the unwavering support of his wife of more than 40 years, Illene.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all Members of the House when I thank Captain Harrington for his 4 decades of service to the community and wish him all the best in his retirement years. I cannot think of anyone who is more deserving of a relaxing and an enjoyable retirement.

TEEN PREGNANCY PREVENTION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the month of May is Teen Pregnancy Prevention Month.

Teen pregnancy is a condition that can be prevented. But prevention is difficult for most Americans.

Parents must stop thinking that we cannot talk about sexual topics until children are older because kids are too young or will be too embarrassed.

Conversations need to start early because teens start early, TV starts early, and society starts early.

It is easier to find televised debates on abortion, gun control or affirmative action than it is to find a discussion about teen pregnancy prevention.

Our society likes issues that can be squeezed into ideological formats between commercial breaks. For many years the teen pregnancy prevention debate fit nicely into that televised ideological format.

There is no easy answer. Abstinence only was held by some. Abstinence is indeed the first and the best position for teens. Others thought contraceptive education was the major answer.

While this debate went on, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the pregnancy rates contin-

ued to rise and people on both sides of this debate grew weary.

Many thoughtful leaders engaged and developed new programs that combine strong emphasis on abstinence, especially for teen 16 and younger, with counseling on contraception.

Teens need the knowledge and skills to avoid sex if they are not ready . . . they need to know that it is okay to say no.

And teens who are sexually active need knowledge on how to use contraception to avoid pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases.

Recent studies confirm that it is important for teens to hear both messages . . . abstinence and contraception . . . which is known as a dual message.

The idea is that teaching clear values is essential to helping teens avoid early sexual activity and pregnancy; but contraceptive advice is needed as a backup.

I agree with University of Maryland professor William Galston who said: "contraceptive technique without values gets you no where, but values without a safety net is a risky business."

According to the May 1, 1998 report just released, by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, teen birth rates declined substantially nationwide between 1991 and 1996.

These recent declines reverse the 24 percent rise in the teen birth rate from 1986 through 1991. The report, which focused solely on teenage childbearing, between 1991 and 1996, reveals that teen birth rates declined for white, black, American Indian, Asian or Pacific Islander and Hispanic women between ages 15 and 19.

The latest state by state data, from 1995 shows that teen birth rates have declined in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The preliminary U.S. teen birth rate for 1996 was down 4 percent from 1995 and 12 percent from 1991.

This shows that our concerted effort to reduce teen pregnancy is succeeding.

The federal government, the National Campaign to Prevent Teen pregnancy, the private sector, parents and caregivers are all helping send the same message:

Don't become a parent until you are truly ready to support a child.

However, teen birth rates are higher today than in the mid 1980s, when the rate was at its lowest point.

It is critical that our nation continue to take a clear stand against teen pregnancy.

We have to instill in the total population that this is a problem to be solved by the whole community.

Mr. Speaker, we must all be engaged in this effort.

TRIBUTE TO IRVING E. ROGERS, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to one of the Nation's great newspaper publishers, Irving E. Rogers, Jr., who passed away this morning at age 68. Mr. Rogers and his family have owned the Eagle-Trib-

une in Lawrence, Massachusetts, for 100 years, and it remains one of the last local family-owned newspapers in America.

Mr. Rogers was a successful businessman, a tireless advocate for his readers and his community, a generous philanthropist, a devoted friend and, above all, a dedicated family man. His passing will be mourned by all those who have benefited from his wisdom, good works, and adherence to the highest standards of journalism. The people of Greater Lawrence and the Merrimack Valley and the institutions that make it a great place to raise a family and run a business have lost a true champion and a giant of a man.

Born in Lawrence in 1929 and raised in North Andover, Mr. Rogers was educated at the Admiral Billard Academy in New London, Connecticut; Norwich University in Northfield, Vermont; and the Bently School of Accounting in Boston before joining the family newspaper business. He was the third generation of the Rogers family to run the Eagle-Tribune.

After 22 years as general manager of the newspaper, he was named publisher on August 29, 1982, by his late father Irving E. Rogers, Sr. This was 40 years to the day after the senior Rogers had been named publisher by his father, Scottish immigrant Alexander H. Rogers, who bought the two newspapers that became the Eagle-Tribune in 1898.

Today, Mr. Rogers' son, Irving E. "Chip" Rogers, III, carries on the family's proud tradition for a fourth generation of the newspaper's general manager. It is not an accident the Eagle-Tribune has been recognized as one of the best regional newspapers in the country. This is the result of Mr. Rogers' commitment to excellence in journalism and in maintaining the Eagle-Tribune as a family-owned newspaper that knows and cares about its community and covers it aggressively and fairly.

He received the highest honor in journalism when the Eagle-Tribune won in 1988 the Pulitzer Prize for general news reporting for its probe of the Massachusetts prison furlough program. Under his leadership, the newspaper was also a finalist for two other Pulitzer Prizes during this decade for an exposé on corruption by former hockey czar R. Alan Eagleson and coverage of the devastating fire that destroyed Malden Mills and the heroic effort to rebuild the plant in the heart of Lawrence's poorest neighborhood. The Eagle-Tribune has also been named New England Newspaper of the Year 13 times.

While winning awards every year for quality reporting and public service, Mr. Rogers was also making business decisions that allowed the Eagle-Tribune to remain in family hands at a time when publications across the country were being taken over by chains and corporations. He purchased the Andover Townsman, moved into New Hampshire when he bought the

Derry News, and recently negotiated the purchase of the Haverhill Gazette.

When the Eagle-Tribune outgrew its original headquarters in downtown Lawrence, he opened a modern plant in North Andover and became a pioneer in the use of photos, color graphics, and bold newspaper design, while insisting that his newspaper maintain traditional standards of fairness and language.

He was devoted, generous, and always available to his 400 employees. When the newspapers of New England were hit by a brutal recession in the early 1990s, advertising revenues declined and newsprint costs soared. Mr. Rogers was a rarity. He never issued a layoff notice.

He also showed an unwavering commitment to his private charity. He was a generous benefactor to so many important institutions in the Merrimack Valley led by the Rogers Family Foundation: the Lawrence Boys and Girls Club, Merrimack College, the United Way, Holy Family Hospital, Lawrence General Hospital, St. Mary's Church, the American Cancer Society, St. Michael's Church, and countless other community organizations. Every year, the Eagle-Tribune Santa Fund provides hundreds of thousands of dollars for the needy at Christmas.

Mr. Rogers was a friend to presidents and governors and leaders of industry. Despite his great influence, he was an unassuming man. He walked his dog every morning, he lunched at the Lantern Brunch in Andover, and fished off Seabrook Beach and Gloucester. His priority was always his wife Jacqueline and children Chip, Debbie, Marty and Steve, along with his grandchildren, and the nieces and nephews left by his brother, Allan B. Rogers, a former Eagle-Tribune editor who died in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have known Irving Rogers as a friend and admired him as a leader in our community. My wife Ellen and I extend our deepest sympathies to him and his family.

1990 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week the Subcommittee on the Census held a hearing on the 1990 census, and once again, the record is full of mistakes. Let me, once again, put the facts on the table so that Congress can make its decisions on what really happened.

Some of the errors at the hearing are because most of the members and staff on the Republican side are new to the issue, and get confused about which facts apply to 1990 and which to previous censuses. Some of the errors occurred because two of the three statisticians who testified had no previous experience with the census undercount issue. It is often useful to get fresh minds to think about a problem, but in this case it also resulted in people making statements when they did not have the facts to support their position.

At last week's hearing the statement was made that in 1990 50 percent of the undercount came from problems in the address list. That is wrong. The facts are that in 1990 70 percent of those missed were in households that were counted, and the address list was 97.5 percent accurate.

One of the witnesses criticized the Post Enumeration Survey because it put more people into the census than other methods said were missing. That too is wrong. The problem with the Post Enumeration Survey in 1990 was that despite the Census Bureau's best efforts, it will miss people. In 1990 the Post-Enumeration Survey showed that the census net undercount was 1.6 percent, while the Census Bureau's Demographic Analysis, which they have done since 1940, showed an undercount rate of 1.8 percent.

Finally, one witness said that after the 2000 census there would be no Demographic Analysis. That is just wrong.

These are not all of the mistakes made at that hearing, but they do illustrate the point that new-comers to this issue are having a hard time understanding the facts. What I find more troubling is the intentional misrepresentation of information.

At last week's hearing the majority tried to suggest that the 1990 census was actually better than the 1980 census. To do that they took the measure of the undercount of Blacks from Demographic analysis in 1980 and compared it to the Post Enumeration Survey estimate of undercount for Blacks for 1990. I would hope that our Subcommittee Chairman is a good enough statistician to know that is wrong. In 1980, Demographic Analysis shows that the undercount of Blacks was 4.5 percent. In 1990 it was 5.7 percent. The Post Enumeration Survey shows a lower undercount for Blacks because even after the Census Bureau's best efforts, the survey still misses some people.

Unfortunately, it wasn't bad enough that the majority tried to minimize the fact that the census misses millions of poor and minorities. What they are really concerned about is that the Census Bureau may take out the millions of people who are counted twice. On the one hand they are saying that they don't care that millions of Blacks, and Hispanics and Asians and the poor are left out of the census. At the same time they are saying, don't you dare take out any of those white suburbanites who were counted twice in my district.

Following the 1990 census, there was a broad and bipartisan consensus that we had to find a better way to conduct the census—to improve the accuracy of the counts and to control the cost. For several years, while experts toiled over alternative methods and the Census Bureau threw its energies into research, Republican in Congress paid little attention. In fact, the appropriators kept prodding the Census Bureau to move more quickly to develop a plan for a better census.

It was not until consultants working for the Republican National Committee decided that the use of sampling methods to help fix the problem of undercounting might hurt Republicans in the redistricting process that the party leaders stood up and took notice. All of a sudden, scientific methods that the National Academy of Sciences, the General Accounting Office, and the Commerce Department's Inspector General had recommended a few years earlier, were no good. They were "unscien-

tific" according to a report pushed through by the majority of the Government Reform Committee. All of a sudden, the National Academy of Science was politically biased, and the Census Bureau incapable of conducting a census. Even the Speaker of the House changed his position on the issue. In 1991 he supported adjustment. In 1996 he did a 360 degree turn around.

Now, I ask you: Is there any basis for the strong and sudden opposition to the use of scientific sampling methods in the 2000 census among Republicans, other than their concern that a more accurate count of African Americans and Hispanics and Asian Americans and poor people might somehow work to their disadvantage when political district boundaries are drawn.

Let's not try to fool the American people with talk about the efficacy of choosing this post-stratification variable or that. All of this minutiae is meant to do one thing only: to confuse the American people, to make them think the Census Bureau isn't capable of honest, to undermine public confidence in the entire census process. All because Republican leaders believe that their hold on political power will slip if the census more accurately reflects the true composition of our diverse population.

How utterly irresponsible! How utterly devoid of any shred of moral imperative. I ought to be angry or outraged. Instead I am genuinely saddened. Saddened because one of the most fundamental activities of our democratic system of governance is being belittled and diminished for partisan political advantage. The census and the Census Bureau may forever be tarnished by this organized effort to tear down the messenger because some people don't like the message.

This is a sad day and a low point for this Congress. I hope my Republican colleagues will look within themselves before they continue on their campaign of terror against science in general, and the Census Bureau in particular. I hope they will decide if they really want to live with the consequences of their plan to ensure that the 2000 census will continue to miss millions of people and that the Census Bureau will be diminished in the eyes of the public.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE MEASURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support additional trade measures important to the agriculture community.

On Tuesday of this week, just several days ago, I outlined broad trade issues that need to be addressed for U.S. farmers and ranchers. These include opening new markets, using our existing trade tools, and removing damaging sanctions that penalize the American producer.

Tonight I would like to cite a specific example of where our trade tools and policy should be used. The U.S. wheat gluten industry has a long-standing battle with the European Union regarding the EU's excessive subsidies and market-distorting trade barriers.